QTLs associated with growth traits and abdominal fat weight and their interactions with gender and hatch in commercial meat-type chickens

G. Atzmon*,†, Y. I. Ronin‡, A. Korol‡, N. Yonash§, H. Cheng¶ and J. Hillel*

*Robert H. Smith Institute of Plant Sciences & Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rehovot 76100, Israel.
†Department of Medicine and Diabetes Research Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Institute for Aging Research, Bronx, NY 10461, USA.
‡Institute of Evolution, University of Haifa, Mt Carmel, Haifa 31905, Israel.
§Hazera Genetics Ltd, Mivhor Research Center, M.P. Lachish, Darom 79354, Israel.
¶USDA-ARS, Avian Disease and Oncology Laboratory, 3606 E. Mount Hope Rd, East Lansing, MI 48823, USA.

Summary

Associations between microsatellite markers and traits related to growth and fatness were investigated using resource broiler population. A sire-line \times dam-line F_1 male was backcrossed to 12 dam-line females to produce 24 sires and 47 dams of the backcross 1 (BC₁) generation. These 71 parents were genotyped with 76 microsatellite markers. Following full-sib mating among the parents, 234 BC₁–F₂ progeny were phenotyped for five growth traits (body weight at 49 days from hatch, wog weight, front half weight, breast weight and tender weight) and abdominal fat weight. Maximum likelihood analysis was used to estimate the marker effects and to evaluate their statistical significance. Individual marker—trait analysis revealed 44 significant associations out of the 456 marker—trait combinations. Correction for multiple comparisons by controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) resulted in 12 significant associations at FDR = 10% with markers on chromosomes 1, 2, 5 and 13. Seventy-five percent of the 44 significant associations displayed no dependence on either hatch or gender; half of the remaining associations displayed dependence of the quantitative trait loci (QTL) effect on hatch \times gender interaction. Thus, the analysed traits in this study may be dependent on external factors.

Keywords broilers, chicken, gender, hatch, interactions, maximum likelihood, quantitative trait loci.

Introduction

Several genome-wide search studies in chicken have been conducted during the last few years. Van Kaam et al. (1999) studied the association of markers and growth traits using 420 genetic markers and a large population size. The resource population was based on a cross between two parental lines that were previously selected for high body weight. The resulting number of detected quantitative trait loci (QTL) was very limited. Using the same population, no significant QTL affecting growth traits were found by Hamoen et al. (2001) following a Z-chromosome scan.

Address for correspondence

J. Hillel, Robert H. Smith Institute of Plant Sciences & Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Quality Sciences, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rehovot 76100, Israel.

E-mail: hillel@agri.huji.ac.il

Accepted for publication 7 May 2006

Sewalem *et al.* (2002) used 101 microsatellite markers and an F_2 population resulting from a cross of a broiler sire-line and an egg-laying line in a genome-wide analysis to detect QTL affecting body weight at 3, 6 and 9 weeks with QTLs located on chromosomes 1, 2, 4, 7, 8 and 13. Carlborg *et al.* (2004) used a novel approach (simultaneous mapping of epistatic QTL) to increase power for QTL detection; they revealed clusters of QTL pairs with similar genetic effects on growth. Carlborg *et al.* (2004) and De Koning *et al.* (2004) investigated the application of QTL identified in experimental crosses of chickens to commercial populations. Following intensive selection for efficient growth in broilers for more than 50 generations, many QTL affecting these traits are still segregating.

The objective of the current study was to identify microsatellite marker loci associated with growth performance and abdominal fat deposition in chickens using a commercial broiler resource population. In addition, we tested whether the QTLs detected in this study by the maximum likelihood (ML) approach are independent of hatch and/or of gender.

Materials and methods

Resource population

A resource population was established by the Arbor Acres Farm (AAF) poultry breeding company. A single grandsire produced from a cross between the male-line L-03 and the female-line L-14 was backcrossed with 12 randomly selected granddams of the female-line L-14. From these crosses, 353 backcross 1 (BC₁) progeny in four hatches were obtained. Seventy-one of these progeny (24 males and 47 females) were chosen randomly as the parents of the next generation. Two hundred and thirty-four BC₁-F₂ progeny from full-sib matings of the 71 parents were phenotyped for the following traits: body weight at 7 weeks of age, abdominal fat weight, wog weight (slaughtered chicken body without head and feathers), front half weight (mainly legs), breast weight and tender weight (a part of the breast that is tucked underneath the main part of the breast). Mean values and standard errors are given in Table 1. All birds were reared in the AAF facilities, fed ad libitum, weighed and slaughtered at 7 weeks of age. Carcass components were evaluated at the slaughterhouse.

Genotyping

Blood samples were taken from each individual of generations F_1 (13) and BC_1 (71). The 13 grandparents were genotyped with about 150 microsatellite markers of which 50% (76) were informative, with the grandsire being heterozygous and his mate having a different heterozygote genotype. The 76 informative markers were on 22 of the 39 chicken chromosomes.

The 71 parents from generation BC_1 were genotyped with the 76 informative microsatellite markers. Based on the genotype information, we determined the marker alleles that were transferred from the grandsire to his 24 sons (sires of BC_1) and to his 47 daughters (dams of BC_1).

Statistical methodology

Mean scores of progeny per genotype were transformed by scaling and centralizing the data as follows: the trait value of each phenotype x_{ij} was replaced by $(x_{ij}-m_i)/s_i$, where m_i and s_i are the mean and standard deviation values respectively of the trait in each of the four hatch–gender groups. We adopted the QTL–environment interaction model to examine the QTL interaction effects with gender (G), hatch (H) and their interaction (G × H; Jansen *et al.* 1995; Korol *et al.* 1998). In fitting the mapping model, we allowed for different m_i and s_i in the model.

Because of large map distances between most markers, we used a marker analysis instead of an interval analysis. For an arbitrary genotype j, the trait measurement in the ith environment (one of the four gender \times hatch combinations) can be presented as:

$$x_{ij} = \mu_i + 0.5ga_i + e_{ij},\tag{1}$$

where μ_i is the mean trait value in the *i*th environment, g is either +1 (for q_1 genotypes) or -1 (for q_2 genotypes), a_i is the effect of allele substitution at putative QTL on trait in environment i, and e_i is a random variable with zero mean and variance σ_i^2 . If we find that $a_i\sigma$ for any i, then no $G \times E$ interaction is manifested by q_1/q_2 . Model (1) was used to analyse our data based on the ML procedure implemented in MultiQTL (http://www.multiqtl.com).

In cases where the QTL effect depended on gender [male (m) vs. female (f)], hatch [hatch 1 (h₁) vs. hatch 2 (h₂)] or their interaction, one may reduce the QTL detection power by ignoring this dependence. Therefore, our analysis included the general case assuming that the QTL effect may vary among the four groups: h₁f, h₁m, h₂f and h₂m. The next step was testing submodels for the dependence of QTLs on hatch, on gender or on the interaction between them: (1) h₁ \neq h₂ & m = f; (2) h₁ = h₂ & m \neq f; (3) h₁ \neq h₂ & m \neq f and (4) h₁ = h₂ & m = f. A log-likelihood ratio of one of the first three hypotheses to that of the fourth allows testing the significance of the corresponding interaction (QTL × hatch, QTL × gender).

After significance testing of the main effects and the foregoing interactions for each marker—trait combination, the experiment-wise level of significance was calculated using the false discovery rate (FDR) approach developed by Benjamini & Hochberg (1995).

Results

Significant marker-trait associations

Markers in this study were distantly distributed relative to each other, with an average interval of 50 cM. Therefore, it was not possible to use an interval mapping approach, and the data were analysed using single marker-trait associations. For each progeny group, i.e. sires (S), dams (D), or dams + sires (D + S), we analysed 76 markers for each of the six traits. Thus, the number of individual tests H_1 vs. H_0 (presence vs. absence of association) were 456 (76 markers \times 6 traits). The significance of deviation from H_0 was performed by a permutation test for each marker-trait combination. Significant markers were chosen following ML analysis using one of three tests: S, D or D + S (Table 1). The total number of significant marker-trait associations (P < 0.05) was 44, including 17 significant H₁ cases for sires, 17 for dams and 10 for dams and sires. In 33 cases (75%), the effect of the QTL on the trait was independent of the gender, hatch or the interaction between them

 Table 1
 Significant marker-trait associations without adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Broaty weight! M = 1207 g. SE = 34 g. AQLOROPY 1 319 D (44) 4 -0.56 (0.95) 0.007 1000 Workwoogeth! M = 1246 g. SE = 28.3 ACCONDOR 1 0 = 5 (66) 1 -0.95 (-0.095) 0.007 1000 Workwoogeth! M = 1546 g. SE = 28.3 ACCONDOR 1 0 = 5 (66) 4 -0.51 (0.95) 0.007 1000 Workwoogeth! M = 1546 g. SE = 28.3 ACCONDOR 1 2 0 (41) 4 -0.51 (0.95) 0.007 1000 Mockwoogeth Workwoogeth! M = 1546 g. SE = 14.6 ACCONDOR 2 0 (41) 4 -0.98 (0.98) 0.007 1000 Front half weight, M = 1546 g. SE = 14.6 ACCONDOR 3 2 0 (41) 4 -0.56 (0.98) 0.007 1000 Front half weight, M = 1546 g. SE = 14.6 ACCONDOR 3 2 0 (41) 4 -0.56 (0.98) 0.007 1000 Front half weight, M = 1546 g. SE = 14.6 ACCONDOR 3 2 0 (41) 4 -0.56 (0.98) 0.007 1000 ACCONDOR <th>Trait¹</th> <th>Marker</th> <th>Chromosome</th> <th>Position</th> <th>Model (n)²</th> <th>Submodel³</th> <th>d/o⁴</th> <th>P-value⁵</th> <th>Number of permutations</th>	Trait ¹	Marker	Chromosome	Position	Model (n) ²	Submodel ³	d/o ⁴	P-value ⁵	Number of permutations
MCWORDIZ 1 394 D + S (64) 1 -0082-0-80295 00001 MCWORDIZ 2 274 D + S (64) 3 -014,0350-96 00003 ADLOUZDS 13 274 D (38) 34 0.14,10350-96 0.003 ADLOUZDS 1 324 5 (26) 4 -051/0.95 0.015 ADLOUZDS 1 324 5 (26) 4 -038/0.89 0.015 ADLOUZD 1 324 5 (26) 4 -038/0.89 0.005 ADLOUZD 1 324 5 (26) 4 -038/0.89 0.005 ADLOUZD 1 324 5 (23) 4 -038/0.89 0.005 ADLOUZD 3 2 0 (41) 4 -038/0.89 0.003 ADLOUZD 3 2 0 (41) 4 -038/0.99 0.003 ADLOUZD 3 1 4 -038/0.99 0.003 ADLOUZD 3 1 4 <t< td=""><td>Body weight, $M = 2267$ g, $SE = 34.6$</td><td>ADL0037</td><td>_</td><td>319</td><td>D (44)</td><td>4</td><td>-0.56/0.95</td><td>0.0072</td><td>10 000</td></t<>	Body weight, $M = 2267$ g, $SE = 34.6$	ADL0037	_	319	D (44)	4	-0.56/0.95	0.0072	10 000
MCW0008 2 774 D+5 (64) 3.a 014;09340.96 0.023 ADL0255 13 2 D (41) 3.a 0.14;170.98 0.016 ADL0795 13 2 D (41) 3.a 0.15;1170.98 0.016 ADL0797 1 22 D (41) 3.a 0.15;1170.98 0.016 ADL0787 5 2 D (41) 4 -0.58/0.89 0.000 ADL0787 5 96 D + 5 (64) 4 -0.58/0.89 0.000 ADL0787 5 96 D (45) 4 -0.58/0.89 0.000 ADL0787 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.58/0.93 0.000 ADL0787 3 182 D (45) 4 -0.54/0.93 0.000 ADL0787 3 182 D (43) 4 -0.54/0.93 0.000 ADL0787 3 2 14 4 -0.54/0.93 0.000 ADL0237 3 2		MCW0102	~	394	D + S (65)	_	-0.09; -0.8/0.95	0.0011	1000
ADIO225 13 2 D (41) 4 -051/0.95 0106 ADIO225 1 1 12 D (43) 3 -051/0.95 0.016 ADIO229 1 1 12 D (43) 4 -058/0.89 0.0001 ADIO225 1 274 D + 5 (64) 4 -034/0.98 0.0001 ADIO225 1 394 5 (23) 4 -035/0.98 0.0001 ADIO225 1 394 5 (23) 4 -035/0.89 0.0001 ADIO227 2 64 D (41) 4 -035/0.89 0.0001 ADIO227 3 275 5 (48) 4 -035/0.89 0.001 ADIO227 3 275 5 (48) 4 -036/0.99 0.001 ADIO227 3 275 5 (48) 4 -036/0.93 0.001 ADIO227 3 275 5 (49) 4 -046/0.93 0.003 ADIO227 1		MCW0088	2	274	D + S (64)	3a	0.14; 0.93/0.96	0.023	1000
AOLO079 1 122 D (8) 3.4 0.15; 117/0.98 0.015 ACMU0792 1 234 5 (23) 4 -0.98/0.89 0.0001 ACMU0782 2 274 D + 5 (64) 4 -0.98/0.89 0.0001 ACMU0252 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.98/0.89 0.0001 ACMU0252 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.57/0.92 0.001 ACMU0252 2 64 D (40) 4 -0.57/0.92 0.001 ACMU0252 2 64 D (40) 4 -0.57/0.99 0.004 ACMU0237 3 182 D (43) 4 -0.57/0.69 0.004 ACMU0237 3 182 D (43) 4 -0.57/0.69 0.004 ACMU0237 3 182 D (43) 4 -0.56/0.93 0.001 ACMU0237 3 2 (13) 4 -0.56/0.93 0.001 ACMU0237 3 2 (14) <t< td=""><td></td><td>ADL0225</td><td>13</td><td>2</td><td>D (41)</td><td>4</td><td>-0.51/0.95</td><td>0.016</td><td>1000</td></t<>		ADL0225	13	2	D (41)	4	-0.51/0.95	0.016	1000
MCW0088 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.98/0.89 0.0001 ADLOTAS 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.98/0.89 0.0009 ADLOTAS 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.34/0.98 0.0009 ADLOTAS 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.95/0.99 0.0009 ADLOTAS 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.95/0.99 0.0009 ADLOTAS 1 -0.95/0.99 0.0009 0.0009 0.0009 ADLOTAS 3 22 D (41) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ADLOTAS 3 2 (18) 1 -0.46/0.93 0.0019 ADLOTAS 3 2 (18) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ADLOTAS 3 2 (18) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ADLOTAS 3 2 (14) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ADLOTAS 1 2 (14) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ADLOT	Wog weight, $M = 1546 \text{ g}$, $SE = 28.3$	ADL0019	_	122	D (38)	3a	0.15; 1.17/0.98	0.015	1000
MCW00088 2 274 D+5 (64) 4 0.38/092 0.009 ADLOTAST 5 6 D +5 (64) 4 -0.34/0.98 0.005 ADLOTAST 13 6 D (41) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.005 ADLOTAS 13 394 S (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.006 ADLOTAS 2 64 D (41) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.004 ADLOTAS 3 82 S (18) 4 0.460/0.93 0.001 ADLOTAS 3 182 D (45) 4 0.460/0.93 0.001 ADLOTAS 3 182 D (45) 4 0.740/0.93 0.001 ADLOTAS 13 22 D (41) 4 0.740/0.93 0.001 ADLOTAS 13 23 S (19) 4 0.740/0.94 0.001 ADLOTAS 13 23 S (19) 4 0.740/0.94 0.001 ADLOTAS 13 2 (23)		MCW0102	_	394	S (23)	4	-0.98/0.89	0.0001	10 000
ADLOTINEY 5 96 D+5 (59) 4 -D34/0.98 0.005 ADLOZISZ 13 2 D (41) 4 -D34/0.92 0.0016 ADLOZISZ 13 5 D (41) 4 -D35/0.89 0.0016 ADLOZIZ 2 D (41) 4 -D45/0.92 0.016 ADLOZIZ 2 D (41) 4 -D45/0.99 0.004 ADLOZIZ 3 274 D (45) 4 0.46/0.93 0.004 ADLOZIZ 3 182 D (45) 4 0.74/0.69-0.70/0.94 0.009 ADLOZIZ 3 182 D (41) 4 0.74/0.69-0.70/0.94 0.009 ADLOZIZ 3 182 D (41) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ADLOZIZ 3 2 5 (18) 4 0.74/0.69-0.70/0.94 0.001 ADLOZIZ 3 2 5 (18) 4 0.74/0.69-0.70/0.94 0.001 ADLOZIZ 3 1,24 4		MCW0088	2	274	D + S (64)	4	0.38/0.92	0.009	1000
ADLIOZZES 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.57/0.92 0016 ALDLOZZES 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0001 ALDLOZZES 2 64 D (43) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0001 ALDLOZZE 2 274 D + S (64) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ALDLOZZE 3 274 D + S (64) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 ALDLOZZE 3 182 S (18) 4 0.76/0.93 0.0019 ALDLOZZE 13 2.8 D (43) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ALDLOZZE 13 2.8 D (24) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ALDLOZZE 13 2.8 D (24) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ALDLOZZE 13 2.0 D (41) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ALDLOZZE 1 3.0 D (43) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ALDLOZZE 1		ADL0187	5	96	(69) S + Q	4	-0.34/0.98	0.025	1000
MCW07102 1 394 5 (33) 4 -0.95/0.89 00001 ADL0752 2 64 D (40) 4 -0.95/0.89 00001 MCW0788 2 24 D (40) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0044 HUJ0006 3 89 5 (18) 1 -0.74/0.69; -0.70/0.94 0.0049 ADL0327 3 182 D (45) 3b -0.73/0.88 0.0079 ADL0327 3 182 D (45) 4 -0.74/0.69; -0.70/0.94 0.005 ADL0327 3 182 D (45) 4 -0.74/0.69; -0.70/0.94 0.005 ADL0327 3 182 D (41) 4 -0.74/0.69; -0.70/0.94 0.005 ADL0327 3 182 D (41) 4 -0.74/0.69 0.004 ADL0328 1 3 2 (14) 4 -0.66/0.94 0.005 ADL0329 1 4 0.69/0.90 0.003 0.003 ADL0321 2 <		ADL0225	13	2	D (41)	4	-0.57/0.92	0.016	1000
ADLOTYSZ 2 64 D (40) 4 0.48(0.94) 0.044 MCW0888 2 274 D + S (44) 4 0.48(0.94) 0.0019 HUD0006 3 88 D (45) 3b -0.74(0.69; -0.70/0.94) 0.0019 ADL0237 3 182 D (45) 4 0.72/0.88 0.0019 ADL0237 3 255 S (18) 4 0.72/0.88 0.024 ADL0237 13 25 C (18) 4 0.72/0.88 0.024 ADL0237 13 23 S (18) 4 0.76/0.93 0.014 ADL0370 13 23 S (18) 4 0.66/0.90 0.0019 MCW0125 1 334 S (23) 4 0.66/0.93 0.0019 MCW0128 1 34 S (23) 4 0.66/0.93 0.0019 MCW0128 1 34 S (24) 4 0.66/0.93 0.0019 MCW0128 1 1,40 <td>Front half weight, $M = 807$ g, $SE = 14.6$</td> <td>MCW0102</td> <td>_</td> <td>394</td> <td>S (23)</td> <td>4</td> <td>-0.95/0.89</td> <td>0.0001</td> <td>10 000</td>	Front half weight, $M = 807$ g, $SE = 14.6$	MCW0102	_	394	S (23)	4	-0.95/0.89	0.0001	10 000
MCW088 2 274 D+5 (64) 4 0.46/0.93 0.0019 HUD0006 3 89 S (18) 1 0.46/0.93 0.009 ADL0237 3 182 C (45) 3 -0.34,065/0.97 0.029 ADL0237 3 182 C (45) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ADL0217 9 28 D (24) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ADL0217 9 28 D (24) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ADL0217 13 22 D (41) 4 0.76/0.93 0.01 ADL0217 13 23 5 (19) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ADL0218 1 394 5 (33) 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 ADL0218 1 4 0.76/0.93 0.001 0.002 ADL0218 1 4 0.76/0.93 0.002 ADL0227 2 1 1 0.74/0.94 0.002		ADL0152	2	64	D (40)	4	0.48/0.94	0.044	1000
HUJOOGE 3 89 \$ (18) 1 -0.74/0.68; -0.70/0.94 0.029 ADLO327 3 182 D (45) 3b -0.93; 0.06/0.97 0.024 ADL0327 3 275 S (18) 4 0.74/0.68; -0.70/0.94 0.024 ADL0227 13 2 D (41) 4 0.76/0.93 0.004 ADL0217 3 2 D (41) 4 0.76/0.93 0.013 ADL0216 13 2 D (41) 4 0.76/0.93 0.0013 ADL0310 13 2 D (41) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0013 ADL0310 1 34 S (19) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0013 ADL0320 1 345 S (17)* 4 0.66/0.94 0.0013 ADL0327 2 D (44) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0014 ADL0328 3 2 D (41) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0015 ADL0327 3 2 D (MCW088	2	274	D + S (64)	4	0.46/0.93	0.0019	10 000
ADLO327 3 182 D (45) 3b -033; 0.05/0.97 0.005 ADLO327 3 275 5 (18) 4 0.720.08 0.024 ADLO327 13 22 D (24) 4 0.720.08 0.01 ADLO325 13 2 D (24) 4 0.66/0.93 0.01 ADLO370 13 2 D (41) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 13 23 5 (19) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 1 334 5 (13) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 1 345 5 (13) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 1 345 5 (13) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 1 455 D (44) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 2 121 D (42) 4 0.65/0.98 0.001 ADLO372 3 2 2		9000/NH	3	68	S (18)	_	-0.74/0.69; -0.70/0.94	0.029	1000
ADLO237 3 275 5 (18) 4 0.72/0.88 0.024 ADLO225 13 28 D (24) 4 0.76/0.93 0.01 ADLO225 13 28 D (41) 4 0.66/0.91 0.001 ADLO370 13 23 5 (19) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 13 32 5 (19) 4 0.66/0.94 0.001 ADLO370 1 394 5 (23) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0019 ADLO370 1 394 5 (23) 4 0.66/0.99 0.0019 ADLO370 1 394 5 (23) 4 0.66/0.99 0.0019 ADLO370 1 435 D (44) 4 0.66/0.98 0.0015 ADLO371 2 D (43) 4 0.66/0.98 0.0015 ADLO372 3 2 5 (14) 4 0.66/0.98 0.0015 ADLO372 1 1 1 1		ADL0327	3	182	D (45)	3b	-0.93; 0.05/0.97	0.005	1000
ADL0271 9 28 D (24) 4 0.76/0933 0.01 ADL0225 13 28 D (24) 4 0.76/093 0.0013 5 UMA0353 1 33 (24) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0013 5 UMA0353 1 394 5 (39) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0013 MCW0702 1 394 5 (39) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0019 ADL0738 1 394 5 (39) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0019 MCW0745 1 435 5 (17)* 4 0.66/0.93 0.0019 ADL0737 2 64 D (44) 4 0.51/0.91 0.005 ADL0737 2 140 4 0.56/0.88 0.004 ADL0237 3 2 140 4 0.55/0.89 0.005 ADL0237 3 2 141 4 0.55/0.89 0.004 ADL0247 1 2 141		ADL0237	3	275	S (18)	4	0.72/0.88	0.024	1000
5 MDL0225 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.66/0.91 0.0013 5 UMA0353 1 23 5 (19) 4 -0.66/0.90 0.0028 5 UMA0353 1 310 D + 5 (45) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0019 AMCW0102 1 334 5 (33) 4 0.66/0.94 0.0019 AMCW0145 1 455 D (44) 4 0.51/0.91 0.005 AMCW015 1 455 D (44) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 ADL027 2 (121) D (42) 4 0.56/0.92 0.005 AMCW018 2 274 D (42) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 AMCW016 1 0 (42) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 0.0042 AMCW017 1 0 (42) 4 0.62/0.93 0.0042 0.0042 AMCW017 1 324 5 (33) 4 0.62/0.94 0.0042 <		ADL0211	6	28	D (24)	4	0.76/0.93	0.01	1000
5 UMA0353 13 23 5 (19) 4 0.69/0.90 0.028 5 UMA0353 1 340 5 (43) 4 0.69/0.94 0.0019 ALU7078 1 334 5 (43) 4 0.695/0.89 0.0051 ALU7078 1 435 5 (17)* 4 0.697/0.89 0.0051 ALU7078 1 455 D (44) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0051 ALU7072 2 121 D (42) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0012 ALU227 3 274 D (43) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0012 ALU227 3 275 5 (18) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0012 ALU227 3 275 5 (18) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0013 ALU227 1 4 0.25/0.89 0.0013 0.0024 0.003 ALU227 1 4 0.62/0.88 0.0024 0.003 ALU227 3 4		ADL0225	13	2	D (41)	4	-0.66/0.91	0.0013	10 000
5 UMA0353 1 310 D + S (45) 4 0.60/0.94 0.0019 MCW0702 1 394 S (23) 4 0.65/0.89 0.0051 ADL0798 1 435 S (17)* 4 0.95/0.89 0.0051 ADL0752 1 455 D (44) 4 0.65/0.92 0.0051 ADL0752 2 121 D (40) 4 0.65/0.92 0.0052 ADL0277 2 121 D (40) 4 0.65/0.92 0.0042 ADL0227 3 275 S (18) 4 0.65/0.92 0.0042 ADL0227 3 275 S (18) 4 0.65/0.93 0.0042 ADL0227 1 394 S (23) 4 0.65/0.99 0.0063 ADL0227 1 4 0.65/0.99 0.0063 0.0063 ADL0227 1 4 0.65/0.99 0.0063 ADL0227 2 121 1 1 0.65		ADL0310	13	23	S (19)	4	0.69/0.90	0.028	1000
MCW0702 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0051 ADL0798 1 435 5 (17)* 4 -0.89/0.82 0.005 MCW0745 1 455 D (44) 4 -0.89/0.82 0.005 ADL0752 2 64 D (44) 4 0.51/0.91 0.005 ADL0277 2 121 D (42) 4 0.55/0.82 0.0042 ADL0275 13 275 5 (44) 4 0.55/0.89 0.0022 ADL0225 13 275 5 (41) 1 -0.95/0.89 0.0024 MCW0702 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0034 MCW0705 1 394 5 (23) 4 0.51/0.96 0.0034 MCW0705 1 394 5 (23) 4 0.51/0.96 0.0013 MCW0088 2 274 D (42) 4 0.51/0.96 0.0014 ADL0227 2 127	Tender weight, $M = 72.1$ g, $SE = 1.5$	UMA0353	_	310	D + S (45)	4	0.60/0.94	0.0019	10 000
ADL0198 1 435 S (17)* 4 —0.89/0.82 0.005 MCW0145 1 455 D (44) 4 —0.89/0.82 0.005 ADL0152 2 64 D (44) 4 0.55/0.92 0.0042 ADL0217 2 121 D (42) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 ADL0217 2 121 D 4 S (64) 1 0.12:0.74/0.94 0.0012 ADL0227 3 275 S (18) 4 0.62/0.89 0.0012 ADL0227 1 394 S (23) 4 0.82/0.89 0.003 MCW0176 1 455 D (44) 4 0.54/0.96 0.003 MCW008 2 274 D (42) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0043 ADL0225 13 275 S (18) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0043 ADL0225 13 275 S (18) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0043 ADL0225 13 2		MCW0102	_	394	S (23)	4	-0.95/0.89	0.0051	1000
MCW0745 1 455 D (44) 4 0.51/0.91 0.015 $ADL0752$ 2 64 D (40) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 $ADL0277$ 2 121 D (42) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 $ADL0277$ 2 121 D (42) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0012 $ADL0237$ 3 275 S (18) 4 0.62/0.89 0.0034 $ADL0225$ 13 27 D (41) 1 -0.37 ; $-1.1/0.90$ 0.0068 $ADL0217$ 1 394 S (23) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0063 $ADL0217$ 1 455 D (44) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0063 $ADL0217$ 2 121 D (42) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0063 $ADL0225$ 13 275 S (18) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0043 $ADL0250$ 13 275 S (18) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0044 $ADL0250$ 1<		ADL0198	_	435	S (17)*	4	-0.89/0.82	0.005	1000
ADLO152 2 64 D (40) 4 0.56/0.92 0.0042 ADLO277 2 121 D (42) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0012 ADLO277 2 124 D + S (64) 1 0.62/0.88 0.0012 ADLO237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.62/0.85 0.0034 ADLO225 13 2 D (41) 1 -0.37;-1.1/0.90 0.0034 MCW0102 1 394 S (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0066 MCW0145 1 445 D (44) 4 0.55/0.89 0.003 MCW0088 2 274 D (42) 4 0.55/0.88 0.014 ADL0237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.56/0.95 0.0063 ADL0237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.56/0.95 0.0043 ADL0255 13 2 D (41) 4 0.56/0.93 0.014 ADL0256 13 2		MCW0145	~	455	D (44)	4	0.51/0.91	0.015	1000
ADL0217 2 121 D (42) 4 0.62/0.88 0.0012 MCW0088 2 274 D + S (64) 1 0.12; 0.74/0.94 0.022 ADL0237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.82/0.85 0.0034 ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 1 -0.37;-1.1/0.90 0.0008 MCW0102 1 394 S (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0006 MCW0145 1 455 D (44) 4 0.51/0.96 0.013 MCW0145 1 455 D (44) 4 0.56/0.89 0.006 MCW0088 2 274 D (42) 4 0.56/0.88 0.006 ADL0237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.56/0.98 0.014 ADL0256 13 2 D (41) 4 0.56/0.93 0.014 MCW0109 1 173 S (17) 4 0.93/0.94 0.015 MCW01066 1 3		ADL0152	2	64	D (40)	4	0.56/0.92	0.0042	10 000
MCW0088 2 274 $D+5 (64)$ 1 $0.12; 0.74/0.94$ 0.022 $ADL0237$ 3 275 $5 (18)$ 4 $0.82/0.85$ 0.0034 $ADL0225$ 13 2 $D (41)$ 1 $-0.37; -1.1/0.90$ 0.0008 $MCW0702$ 1 394 $5 (23)$ 4 $-0.95/0.89$ 0.0006 $MCW07045$ 1 455 $D (44)$ 4 $0.54/0.96$ 0.0013 $MCW0708$ 2 121 $D (42)$ 4 $0.54/0.96$ 0.0061 $ADL0227$ 3 274 $D (45)$ 4 $0.54/0.95$ 0.0061 $ADL0225$ 13 275 $5 (18)$ 4 $0.54/0.95$ 0.0061 $ADL0225$ 13 275 $5 (18)$ 4 $0.56/0.93$ 0.0061 $ADL0225$ 13 2 $D (41)$ 4 $0.56/0.93$ 0.0061 $ADL0225$ 13 2 2 2 2		ADL0217	2	121	D (42)	4	0.62/0.88	0.0012	10 000
ADL0237 3 275 5 (18) 4 0.82/0.85 0.0034 ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 1 -0.37;-1.1/0.90 0.0008 MCW0702 1 394 5 (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0006 MCW0745 1 455 D (44) 4 0.51/0.96 0.013 ADL0217 2 121 D (42) 4 0.56/0.88 0.0061 MCW0088 2 274 D (45) 4 0.56/0.88 0.0061 ADL0225 13 275 5 (18) 4 0.56/0.93 0.0063 MCW0080 1 173 5 (17) 4 0.56/0.93 0.0014 MCW0088 2 274 5 (23) 3 1.37; 0.21/0.89 0.015 MCW0088 2 274 5 (23) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 2 274 5 (23) 4 0.69/0.91 0.013 ADL0146 3 300		MCW0088	2	274	D + S (64)	_	0.12; 0.74/0.94	0.022	1000
ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 1 -0.37;-1.1/0.90 0.0008 MCW0702 1 394 \$ (23) 4 -0.95/0.89 0.0006 MCW0745 1 455 D (44) 4 0.51/0.96 0.013 ADL0217 2 121 D (42) 4 0.56/0.88 0.0061 MCW0088 2 274 D (45) 4 0.56/0.88 0.0061 ADL0237 3 275 \$ (18) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0063 ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 4 0.56/0.93 0.0063 MCW0008 1 173 \$ (17) 4 0.93/0.94 0.0012 MCW0008 2 274 \$ (13) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 2 274 \$ (13) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 3 30 D + \$ (42)* 2 -0.63/0.91 0.0039		ADL0237	Э	275	S (18)	4	0.82/0.85	0.0034	10 000
MCW0702 1 394 5 (23) 4 $-0.95/0.89$ 0.0006 $MCW0745$ 1 455 D (44) 4 $0.51/0.96$ 0.013 $ADL0217$ 2 121 D (42) 4 $0.56/0.88$ 0.0061 $MCW0088$ 2 274 D (45) 4 $0.54/0.95$ 0.0063 $ADL0237$ 3 275 S (18) 4 $0.54/0.95$ 0.0063 $ADL0237$ 13 2 D (41) 4 $0.54/0.95$ 0.0063 $ADL025$ 13 2 D (41) 4 $0.56/0.93$ 0.0063 $ADL015$ 1 173 S (17) 4 $0.93/0.94$ 0.0012 $ADL015$ 1 320 S (23) 4 $0.80/0.86$ 0.0039 $ADL0146$ 2 403 S (23) 4 $0.59/0.91$ 0.013 $ADL0166$ 3 300 D + S (42)* 2 $0.087/0.92$ 0.0048		ADL0225	13	2	D (41)	~	-0.37;-1.1/0.90	0.0008	10 000
MCW0145 1 455 D (44) 4 0.51/0.96 0.013 ADL0217 2 121 D (42) 4 0.56/0.88 0.0061 MCW0088 2 274 D (45) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0063 ADL0237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.72/0.88 0.014 ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.66/0.93 0.009 ADL0226 1 173 S (17) 4 0.93/0.94 0.0012 MCW008 1 173 S (13) 4 0.93/0.94 0.015 MCW0088 2 274 S (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 2 403 S (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 LE/0166 3 300 D + S (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048	Breast weight, $M = 290$ g, $SE = 5.4$	MCW0102	_	394	S (23)	4	-0.95/0.89	9000'0	10 000
ADL0217 2 121 D (42) 4 0.56/0.88 0.0061 MCW0088 2 274 D (45) 4 0.54/0.95 0.0063 ADL0237 3 275 S (18) 4 0.72/0.88 0.014 ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.66/0.93 0.0009 ADL0226 1 173 S (17) 4 0.93/0.94 0.0012 MCW008 1 320 S (23) 3b 1.37; 0.21/0.89 0.015 MCW0088 2 274 S (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 2 403 S (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 LE/0166 3 300 D + S (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		MCW0145	_	455	D (44)	4	0.51/0.96	0.013	1000
$MCW0088$ 2 274 D (45) 4 $0.54/0.95$ 0.0063 $ADL0237$ 3 275 $5(18)$ 4 $0.72/0.88$ 0.014 $ADL0225$ 13 2 D (41) 4 $-0.66/0.93$ 0.0009 $ADL0150$ 1 173 $5(17)$ 4 $0.93/0.94$ 0.0009 $ACW0109$ 1 320 $5(23)$ 3b $1.37; 0.21/0.89$ 0.015 $ADL0146$ 2 274 $5(19)$ 4 $0.80/0.86$ 0.0039 $ADL0146$ 2 403 $5(23)$ 4 $-0.59/0.91$ 0.013 $ADL0166$ 3 300 $D+5(42)^*$ 2 $-0.87; 0.25/0.92$ 0.0048		ADL0217	2	121	D (42)	4	0.56/0.88	0.0061	10 000
ADL0237 3 275 5 (18) 4 0.72/0.88 0.014 ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 4 $-0.66/0.93$ 0.0009 ADL0250 1 173 S (17) 4 $0.93/0.94$ 0.0012 MCW0109 1 320 S (23) 3b 1.37; 0.21/0.89 0.015 MCW0088 2 274 S (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 2 403 S (23) 4 $-0.59/0.91$ 0.013 LE/0166 3 300 D + S (42)* 2 -0.87 ; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		MCW0088	2	274	D (45)	4	0.54/0.95	0.0063	10 000
ADL0225 13 2 D (41) 4 -0.66/0.93 0.0009 = 1.3 ADL0150 1 173 S (17) 4 0.93/0.94 0.0012 MCW0109 1 320 S (23) 3b 1.37; 0.21/0.89 0.015 MCW0088 2 274 S (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 ADL0146 2 403 S (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 LE/0166 3 300 D + S (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		ADL0237	3	275	S (18)	4	0.72/0.88	0.014	1000
= 1.3 <i>ADL0150</i> 1 173 5 (17) 4 0.93/0.94 0.0012 <i>MCW0109</i> 1 320 5 (23) 3b 1.37; 0.21/0.89 0.015 <i>MCW0088</i> 2 274 5 (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 <i>ADL0146</i> 2 403 5 (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 <i>LEI0166</i> 3 300 D+5 (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		ADL0225	13	2	D (41)	4	-0.66/0.93	0.000	10 000
1 320 5 (23) 3b 1.37, 0.21/0.89 0.015 2 274 5 (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 2 403 5 (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 3 300 D+5 (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048	Ш	ADL0150	~	173	S (17)	4	0.93/0.94	0.0012	10 000
2 274 5 (19) 4 0.80/0.86 0.0039 2 403 5 (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 3 300 D+5 (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		MCW0109	_	320	S (23)	3b	1.37; 0.21/0.89	0.015	1000
2 403 S (23) 4 -0.59/0.91 0.013 3 300 D + S (42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		MCW0088	2	274	S (19)	4	0.80/0.86	0.0039	10 000
3 300 D+S(42)* 2 -0.87; 0.25/0.92 0.0048		ADL0146	2	403	S (23)	4	-0.59/0.91	0.013	1000
		LE10166	3	300	D + S (42)*	2	-0.87; 0.25/0.92	0.0048	10 000

•	ے
C	Ù
=	ż
2	=
Ξ	3
ż	=
ō	5
()
`	•
7	-
¢	υ

Trait¹

,				ć	ć		ı	Number of
t.	Marker	Chromosome	Position	Model $(n)^2$	Submodel³	d/σ^4	<i>P</i> -value ⁵	permutations
	ADL0143	4	0	D + S (70)	4	0.44/0.97	0.007	1000
	ADL0166	2	162	S (24)	3c	1.32; -0.31/0.90	0.001	1000
	ADL0326	7	142	S (19)	4	0.6/0.88	0.027	1000
	ADL0272	10	37	S (22)	3a	0.82;-0.46/0.88	0.032	2000
	ADL0372	12	0	D + S (50)*	4	-0.53/0.95	0.007	1000
	ADL0273	Z	73	D (47)	4	-0.53/0.95	0.013	1000

¹Mean values (M) and standard errors (SE) are given across hatches and genders.

²D, dams; S, sires; D + S, dams + sires; n, number of subjects in each analysis.

Submodels with h = hatch, m = male, f = female effects: (1) $h_1 \neq h_2 \& m = f_1$, (2) $h_1 = h_2 \& m \neq f_1$, (3) $h_1 \neq h_2 \& m \neq f$ [(a) $(h_1f = h_1m = h_2m) \neq h_2f$, (b) $h_1f \neq (h_1m = h_2m) \neq h_2f$, (c) $h_1m = h_2m$); (c) $h_1m = h_2m$ \neq $(h_1f = h_2f = h_2m)$ and $(4) h_1 = h_2 \& m = f$.

 $^{\prime}$ d/ σ). QTL substitution effect and residual standard variation (if any of the models 1–3 are indicated, corresponding parameters are shown in the order defined by the model). P-value is significance of QTL effects as a deviation using a permutation test.

Significant deviation from the expected 1:1 segregation at the marker locus.

(submodel 4). In four cases (9.1%), interactions between the QTL and hatch were found (submodel 1), and an interaction was found in one case (2.3%) between QTLs and gender (submodel 2). The three-way interaction, i.e. QTL \times hatch \times gender (submodel 3) was found in six cases (13.6%; Table 1). In total, 26 significant markers were detected; some of them were in association with more than one trait (Table 2).

The marker MCW0088 (chromosome 2 at position 274 cM) was significantly associated with all five growth traits, as well as with abdominal fat weight. Two other markers (MCW0102 and ADL0225) were significantly associated with the five growth traits, while ADL0237 was associated with three of them (front half, breast weight and tender weight). The six markers that were significantly associated with breast weight were also significantly associated with tender weight. Among traits, abdominal fat weight had the most associations (11), followed by tender and half weight (nine), breast weight (six), wog weight (five) and body weight (four).

Using the results of the individual trait—marker tests that were declared significant, we calculated the total number of significant cases using FDR analysis. The correction for multiple comparisons was conducted at the 5% and 10% levels of FDR (Table 3). We obtained two significant effects at the 0.05 level and 12 effects at the 0.1 level (Table 3). These 12 effects were associated with only six marker loci on chromosomes 1, 2, 5 and 13; MCWO102 was significant four times, ADL0225 three times and four markers were significant once each.

The sire-average model had the best power in the FDR approach (5%), where two associations were detected at very high significance (0.0001). At lower FDR stringency (10%), the difference between the models decreased so that each of the three models (S, D and D + S) has detected approximately the same number of significant effects (five cases for S, four for D and three for D + S). Among these 12 cases, the most frequent was submodel (4), which assumes no interaction between the QTL effect and gender, hatch or the interaction gender \times hatch.

Dependence of QTL effects on gender and hatch

No interaction between gender and hatch was found for the six traits. We adopted the approach for analysis of a QTL × 'environment' interaction (Jansen *et al.* 1995; Korol *et al.* 1998) by considering hatch and gender as environments for the QTL effects. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.

Significant deviations from model 4 assuming $h_1 = h_2$ & m = f (no dependence of QTL effect on gender, hatch or interaction between them) were detected in 11 of 44 possible cases. Among these 11 cases, four were $\{h_1 \neq h_2, m = f\}$, and one was $\{h_1 = h_2, m \neq f\}$. The remaining were submodels of the model $\{h_1 \neq h_2, m \neq f\}$: three

Table 2 Significant associations between 26 microsatellite markers and the six traits¹ measured in chickens.

Chromosome	Position	Marker	BW	WW	FH	TW	BrW	AF	Total
1	122	ADL0019		Х					1
1	173	ADL0150						X	1
1	310	UMA0353				Χ			1
1	319	ADL0037	Χ						1
1	320	MCW0109						X	1
1	394	MCW0102	Χ	X	Χ	Χ	X		5
1	435	ADL0198				Χ			1
1	455	MCW0145				Χ	X		2
2	64	ADL0152			X	Χ			2
2	121	ADL0217				Χ	×		2
2	274	MCW0088	Χ	X	X	Χ	X	X	6
2	403	ADL0146						X	1
3	89	HUJ0006			X				1
3	182	ADL0327			X				1
3	275	ADL0237			X	Χ	X		3
3	300	LEI0166						X	1
4	0	ADL0143						X	1
5	96	ADL0187						X	1
5	162	ADL0166		X					1
7	142	ADL0326						X	1
9	28	ADL0211			X				1
10	37	ADL0272						X	1
12	0	ADL0372						X	1
13	2	ADL0225	Χ	X	X	Χ	X		5
13	23	ADL0310			X				1
Z	73	ADL0273						X	1
Total		26	4	5	9	9	6	11	44

¹Trait abbreviations are BW, body weight at 7 weeks; WW, wog weight; FH, front half weight; TW, tender weight; BrW, breast weight; AF, abdominal fat weight.

Table 3 Significant QTL effects allowing for QTL-environmental interaction, based on the false discovery rate (FDR) analysis.

Model (S, D, D + S)	FDR (total significance; %)	Trait ¹	Marker	Chromosome	Result (best submodel) ²	<i>P</i> -value (number of permutations)
S (23)	5	WW	MCW0102	1	4	0.0001 (10 000)
S (23)	11	FH	MCW0102	1	4	0.0001 (10 000)
S (23)	10	WW	MCW0102	1	4	0.0001 (10 000)
S (23)	11	FH	MCW0102	1	4	0.0001 (10 000)
S (23)	11	BrW	MCW0102	1	4	0.0006 (10 000)
S (17)	11	AF	ADL0150	1	4	0.0012 (10 000)
S (24)	п	AF	ADL0166	5	3c	0.0010 (10 000)
D (41)	11	FH	ADL0225	13	4	0.0013 (10 000)
D (41)	11	TW	ADL0225	13	1	0.0008 (10 000)
D (42)	11	TW	ADL0217	2	4	0.0012 (10 000)
D (41)	п	BrW	ADL0225	13	4	0.0009 (10 000)
D + S (65)	11	BW	MCW0102	1	1	0.0011 (10 000)
D + S (64)	11	FH	MCW0088	2	4	0.0019 (10 000)
D + S (45)	ii .	TW	UMA0353	1	4	0.0019 (10 000)

¹Trait abbreviations are BW, body weight at 7 weeks; WW, wog weight; FH, front half weight; TW, tender weight; BrW, breast weight; AF, abdominal fat.

²For submodel designations see Table 1.

Table 4 Interactions between QTL and either hatch or gender.

Trait ¹	Marker	Chromosome	Model (n) ²	Result (submodel)	P-value (number of permutations)
BW	MCW0102	1	D + S (65)	1	0.0011 (1000)
	MCW0088	2	D + S (64)	3a	0.023 (1000)
WW	ADL0019	1	D (38)	3a	0.015 (1000)
FH	HUJ0006	3	S (18)	1	0.029 (1000)
	ADL0327	3	D (45)	3b	0.005 (1000)
TW	MCW0088	2	D + S (64)	1	0.022 (1000)
	ADL0225	13	D (41)	1	0.0008 (10 000)
AF	MCW0109	1	S (23)	3b	0.015 (1000)
	LEI0166	3	D + S (42)	2	0.0048 (10 000)
	ADL0166	5	S (24)	3c	0.001 (1000)
	ADL0272	10	S (22)	3a	0.032 (1000)

Here, unlike Tables 1–3, significant deviation from the hypothesis $\{H_0: h_1 = h_2, m = f\}$ was tested assuming the existence of the QTL (i.e. H_0 means that the QTL exists but its effect does not depend on progeny's hatch or gender).

For submodel designations see Table 1.

 $(h_1f=h_1,\ m=h_2m) \neq h_2f,\ two\ h_1f \neq (h_1m=h_2f=h_2m)$ and one $h_1m \neq (h_1f=h_2f=h_2m)$. In other words, 45% of these QTL effects were dependent only on one of the 'environments' (gender or hatch). QTL at MCW0102 was associated with body weight that depended on hatch only (submodel 1). Abdominal fat weight was the only trait in which the QTL effect in females was different from the QTL effect in males.

Discussion

Correction of the results based on the FDR approach reduced the number of significant results from 44 to 2 and 12 associations at 5% and 10% FDR respectively. Clearly, the FDR correction is necessary to compensate for the effect of multiple parallel tests.

Two aspects of the effect of gender and hatch had to be taken into account in the foregoing analysis. First, the trait values may display a dependence on either gender or hatch, or both. Secondly, the QTLs in question may also depend on these 'environmental' factors. If ignored, the dependence of mean trait values on either hatch or gender or hatch x gender may cause biases in the estimated QTL effects because alternative marker groups in the mapping population are unequally represented (owing to rather small sample size of genotyped individuals). A special QTL mapping model was used to deal with the second aspect. In our analysis, a QTL × E model (Jansen et al. 1995; Korol et al. 1998) was used. If the QTL effect depends on the environment and this dependence is ignored in the mapping model, the QTL detection power may be reduced and the resulting estimates are biased (Korol et al. 1998). In our recent analysis, only 20% of the significant trait-marker combinations (11 of 44 cases) displayed QTL \times E interaction (either with hatch or gender), and in 55% of these cases, a three-way interaction was detected.

For the past several years evidence has accumulated about gender differences in amount of body fat and its distribution (Rattarasarn $et\ al.\ 2004$). Men more commonly gain fat in the intra-abdominal visceral fat depots compared with women because of differences in lipid metabolism (Williams 2004). These substantial differences may, in part, be associated with regional regulation of lipolysis and lipogenesis that mediate via α -adrenergic receptors. In vitro and in vivo data support this observation of different lipolytic sensitivity in fat depots in women compared with men. Furthermore, fatty acid uptake in some depots is as high as sevenfold in men compared with women (Williams 2004). Thus, interactions between QTL and gender might be a main factor influencing fat accumulation and distribution.

References

Benjamini Y. & Hochberg Y. (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* 57, 289–300.

Carlborg O., Hocking P.M., Burt D.W. & Haley C.S. (2004) Simultaneous mapping of epistatic QTL in chickens reveals clusters of QTL pairs with similar genetic effects on growth. *Genetical Research* 83, 197–209.

De Koning D.J., Haley C.S., Windsor D., Hocking P.M., Griffin H., Morris A., Vincent J. & Burt D.W. (2004) Segregation of QTL for production traits in commercial meat-type chickens. *Genetical Research* 83, 211–20.

Hamoen F.F., Van Kaam J.B., Groenen M.A., Vereijken A.L. & Bovenhuis H. (2001) Detection of genes on the Z-chromosome

¹Trait abbreviations are BW, body weight at 7 weeks; WW, wog weight; FH, front half weight; TW, tender weight; AF, abdominal fat.

²D, dams; S, sires; D + S, dams + sires; n, number of subjects in each analysis.

- affecting growth and feathering in broilers. Poultry Science 80,
- Jansen R.C., Ooijen J.W., Stam P., Lister C. & Dean C. (1995) Genotype-by-environment interaction in genetic mapping of multiple quantitative trait loci. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 91,
- Korol A.B., Ronin Y.I. & Nevo E. (1998) Approximate analysis of QTL-environment interaction with no limits on the number of environments. Genetics 148, 2015–28.
- Rattarasarn C., Leelawattana R., Soonthornpun S., Setasuban W. & Thamprasit A. (2004) Gender differences of regional abdominal fat distribution and their relationships with insulin sensitivity

- in healthy and glucose-intolerant Thais. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism 89, 6266-70.
- Sewalem A., Morrice D.M., Law A., Windsor D., Haley C.S., Ikeobi C.O., Burt D.W. & Hocking P.M. (2002) Mapping of quantitative trait loci for body weight at three, six, and nine weeks of age in a broiler layer cross. Poultry Science 81, 1775-81.
- Van Kaam J.B., Groenen M.A., Bovenhuis H., Veenendaal A., Vereijken A.L. & Van Arendonk J.A. (1999) Whole genome scan in chickens for quantitative trait loci affecting carcass traits. Poultry Science 78, 1091-9.
- Williams C.M. (2004) Lipid metabolism in women. Proceedings of the Nutrition Society 63, 153-60.